

ACCE Policy Summit Agenda December 2-4, 2015

Date	Time	Program	Room Name
Wednesday, December 2	7:00 AM - 6:30 PM	ALEC/ACCE Registration	Culture Keeper Registration
Wednesday, December 2	9:00 AM - 3:00 PM	Exhibit Hall Open	Hall of State
Wednesday, December 2	10:00 AM - 11:30 AM	ACCE New Member Orientation and Media Training	Cushing A,B
Wednesday, December 2	12:00 PM - 2:00 PM	Opening Lunch	Kierland Ballroom
Wednesday, December 2	2:15 PM - 3:30 PM	ACCE Workshop: Trending Regulations in Local Government Hurting Economic Growth	Cushing A,B
Wednesday, December 2	3:45 PM - 5:00 PM	ACCE Workshop: New HUD Regulations are Taking Away Local Control	Cushing A,B
Wednesday, December 2	5:00 PM - 6:30 PM	Arizona Holiday Reception	Marshall's Outpost/Lawn
Thursday, December 3			
Thursday, December 3	7:00 AM - 6:00 PM	ALEC/ACCE Registration	Culture Keeper Registration
Thursday, December 3	8:00 AM - 9:15 AM	Breakfast	Kierland Ballroom
Thursday, December 3	9:00 AM - 3:00 PM	Exhibit Hall Open	Hall of State
Thursday, December 3	9:30 AM - 10:45 AM	ACCE Workshop: Restructuring Federal and State Grants to Local Governments	Cushing A,B
Thursday, December 3	11:00 AM - 12:15 PM	ACCE Workshop: Federalism and Dillon Rule Promote Limited Government	Cushing A,B
Thursday, December 3	12:30 PM - 2:15 PM	Lunch	Kierland Ballroom
Thursday, December 3	2:30 PM - 3:30 PM	ACCE Workshop: Creating a Fair Tax Policy for Local Economic Growth	Cushing A,B
Friday, December 4			
Friday, December 4	7:30 AM - 3:00 PM	ALEC/ACCE Registration	Culture Keeper Registration
Friday, December 4	8:00 AM - 9:15 AM	Breakfast	Kierland Ballroom
Friday, December 4	9:00 AM - 3:00 PM	Exhibit Hall Open	Hall of State
Friday, December 4	9:30 AM - 10:30 AM	ACCE Model Policy Meeting	Cushing A,B
Friday, December 4	12:30 PM - 2:15 PM	Lunch	Kierland Ballroom



American City County Exchange
ACCE Policy Summit | Scottsdale, Arizona
Friday, December 4, 2015
9:30AM - 10:30 AM

- 9:30 AM** **1. Call to Order**
Welcome and Introductions
- 1.1 Approval of Minutes from ACCE Annual Meeting 2015**
- 2.0 Changes to the Agenda**
- 3.0 New member introductions**
- 4.0 Election to fill the unexpired term of Public Sector National Chair**
- Presentations and Model Policy
- 10:00 AM** **5.0 Model Policy Consideration: ACCE Principles of Taxation**
- 10:20 AM** **5.1 Model Policy Consideration: Local Tax Payer Bill of Rights**
- 10:25 AM** **6.0 For the Good of the Order**
- 10:30 AM** **7.0 Adjournment**

ACCE Business Meeting Minutes

Hyatt Manchester San Diego, CA

7/23/15

3:30PM

Meeting Called to Order by Public Sector Chairman John Harkins & Acting Private Sector Chairman Bruce Hollands

- 1. The Open and Fair Competition Resolution for Municipal [or Local] Water and Wastewater Projects**
 - Policy passed unanimously
- 2. Regulation Containers to Protect Business and Consumer Choice**
 - (5) Amendments passed unanimously
 - Policy passed unanimously
- 3. Drone/UAV Ordinance (First reading)**
- 4. ACCE Director Jon Russell gave an update on ACCE operations**

Meeting Adjourned

ACCE Principles of Taxation

The proper function of taxation is to raise money for core functions of government, not to direct the behavior of citizens or close budget gaps created by overspending. This is true regardless of whether government is big or small, and this is true for lawmakers at all levels of government.

Taxation will always impose some level of burden on an economy's performance, but that harm can be minimized if policymakers resist the temptation to use the tax code for social engineering, class warfare and other extraneous purposes. A principled tax system is an ideal way for advancing a local government's economic interests and promoting prosperity for its residents.

The goal of local tax policy should be to raise revenue for functions of government in a way that minimizes distortions, so as to grow the overall economy and facilitate commerce.

Guiding principles of taxation

The fundamental principles presented here provide guidance for a neutral and effective tax system; one that raises needed revenue for core functions of government, while minimizing the burden on citizens.

- **Simplicity** – The tax code should be easy for the average citizen to understand, and it should minimize the cost of complying with the tax laws. Tax complexity adds cost to the taxpayer, but does not increase public revenue. For governments, the tax system should be easy to administer, and should help promote efficient, low-cost administration.
- **Transparent** – Tax systems should be accountable to citizens. Taxes and tax policy should be visible and not hidden from taxpayers. Changes in tax policy should be highly publicized and open to public debate.
- **Economic Neutrality** – The purpose of the tax system is to raise needed revenue for core functions of government, not control the lives of citizens or micromanage the economy. The tax system should exert minimal impact on the spending and decisions of individuals and businesses. An effective tax system should be broad-based, utilize a low overall tax rate with few loopholes, and avoid multiple layers of taxation through tax pyramiding.
- **Equity and Fairness** – The government should not use the tax system to pick winners and losers in society, or unfairly shift the tax burden onto one class of citizens. The tax system should not be used to punish success or to “soak the rich,” engage in discriminatory or multiple taxation, nor should it be used to bestow special favors on any particular group of taxpayers.
- **Complementary** – The tax code should help maintain a healthy relationship between the state and local governments. The state should always be mindful of how its tax decisions affect local governments so they are not working against each other – with the taxpayer caught in the middle.
- **Competitiveness** – A low tax burden can be a tool for a local government's private sector economic development by retaining and attracting productive business activity. A high-quality revenue system

will be responsive to competition from other jurisdictions. Effective competitiveness is best achieved through economically neutral tax policies.

- Reliability – A high-quality tax system should be stable, providing certainty in taxation and in revenue flows. It should provide certainty of financial planning for individuals and businesses.

Benefits of a principled tax burden

Since taxes lower the economic welfare of citizens, policymakers should try to minimize the economic and social problems that taxation imposes. Citizens then directly gain the benefits of a low tax burden. These benefits are summarized below:

- Greater economic growth – A tax system that allows citizens to keep more of what they earn spurs increased work, saving and investment. A low state tax burden would mean a competitive advantage over states with high-rate, overly progressive tax systems.
- Greater wealth creation – Low taxes significantly boost the value of all income-producing assets and help citizens maximize their fullest economic potential, thereby broadening the tax base.
- Minimize micromanagement and political favoritism – A complex, high-rate tax system favors interests that are able to exert influence in the state capitol, and who can negotiate narrow exemptions and tax benefits that help only limited taxpayers and not the general economy. “A fair field and no favors” is a good motto for a strong tax system.

ACCE Principles of Short Term Housing Rental Regulations

Short-term housing rentals are becoming an important component of the travel and tourism economy in many communities throughout the country. Recently, some jurisdictions have passed -- or are considering the passage of -- onerous and burdensome regulations for short-term rentals, severely threatening this important new industry. As advances in technology have allowed owners, managers, and hosts to more easily connect with travelers looking for alternative accommodations, short-term rentals have grown in popularity. Short-term rentals provide a flexible housing option that allows travelers to spend longer periods of time in communities, in turn increasing their contributions to local small businesses. As such, municipalities should embrace this economic opportunity by working with industry stakeholders to establish a reasonable framework for regulating short-term rental activity so that all may benefit. Successful short-term regulation allows for municipalities to easily identify and contact a short-term rental owner, make the tax collection and remittance obligations clear and reasonable, and ensure that short-term rentals remain an option for travelers. Furthermore, the most successful regulations balance the needs of long-term residents and the community as a whole.

Guiding Principles of Short-Term Housing Rental Regulations

- Short-term rentals are a non-commercial activity considered under the same or similar guidelines and laws as those governing long-term residential properties.
- No additional laws or ordinances are necessary for dealing with neighborhood or nuisance issues, and the enforcement of existing municipal and city codes that apply to full-time residents is sufficient.
- Tax collection and remittance is not the responsibility of the platform or intermediary through which a short-term rental is located by a traveler or through which a reservation or payment is made. Tax collection and remittance may be offered to owners as an enhancement, but should never be mandated by a municipality.

- In cases where the registration of short-term rentals is desirable and includes the payment of an administrative or licensing fee, such fees shall be limited to a one time cost of \$100 or less and an annual renewal cost not to exceed \$25.
- Any short-term rental regulations should recognize the value of short-term rentals in providing flexible housing stock and legalize and formalize short-term rentals as a unique and valuable alternative for travelers.
- Short-term rental policies should be developed through an open and transparent dialogue among policymakers, industry stakeholders, property owners and the public.

State Sovereignty through Local Coordination Act

Model Policy

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of {insert state}:

Section 1. Title __, chapter __, article __, _____

Revised Statutes, is amended by adding section _____, to read:

Federal Regulations; Local Coordination for Cities, Towns, Counties, and Special Districts

(A) Definitions.

(1) "Coordinate" means the action necessary to achieve coordination.

(2) "Coordination" means the process by which the federal or state government seeks in good faith to reach consistency between a federal or state regulation, rule, plan or policy and a city, town, county, or special district law, regulation, plan or policy that is less restrictive than the federal or state regulation, rule, plan or policy.

(3) "Less restrictive" means a city, town, county, or special district law, regulation, plan or policy imposes or would impose less of a burden on the exercise of rights, privileges or immunities enjoyed by individuals, organizations and businesses within the city's or town's jurisdictional boundaries.

(B) Demand. If a city, town, county, or special district has laws, regulations, plans or policies that are less restrictive than a federal or state regulation, rule, plan or policy, the city, town, county or special district shall demand by any lawful means that the federal or state government coordinate with the city, town, county, or special district before the federal or state government implements, enforces, expands or extends the federal or state regulation, rule, plan or policy within the city's, town's, county's, or special district's jurisdictional boundaries. This subsection is mandatory unless the city, town, county, or special district specifically votes to not demand coordination at a duly noticed public hearing.

(C) Litigation. Unless its elected public body shall vote against authorizing such litigation at a duly noticed public hearing, if the federal government fails to coordinate in good faith with the city, town, county, or special district after demand has been made, the city, town, county, or special district shall authorize appropriate litigation to enforce its coordination rights and powers.

(D) Taxpayer Standing. Any taxpayer residing or doing business within the jurisdiction of the relevant city or town shall have standing to enforce the obligations created by this statute by way of special action filed in state court against the relevant city or town, without first exhausting any administrative remedy, if the relevant city, town, county, or special district fails to discharge its obligations under this statute within sixty (60) days after the taxpayer serves each member of the relevant elected local public body with a written demand that the city or town comply with this statute. To be effective, the written demand must specify the federal and local laws, regulations, plans or policies, with which coordination ought to be sought by the city, town, county, or special district.

Approved by ALEC Board of Directors on September 19, 2010.

**The Open and Fair Competition Resolution for Municipal [or Local] Water
and Wastewater Projects**

Summary

According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), underground piping represents 60 percent of the total spending for water and wastewater infrastructure. Updating procurement policies for water and sewer piping will help municipalities realize significant costs savings and ensure that funds for underground infrastructure are spent more cost-effectively. It is the intention of this resolution to ensure that all proven and acceptable piping materials are included in all bids for water and wastewater projects. All pipe materials should be qualified and selected based on sound engineering principles. The language in the resolution continues to allow autonomy for design engineers, but simply requires the decisions to be governed by established technical standards. By allowing contractors to bid on alternate pipe materials that meet technical performance criteria, the municipality will instill accountability in the procurement process, which will reduce costs, improve quality and foster innovation. This promotion of free competition will ensure limited government resources are being used to the greatest advantage. The goal is to construct a project at the best price and best value for system customers and taxpayers.

Model Policy

{Title, Enacting clause, etc.}

Be it enacted by the [Insert jurisdiction].

Section 1. {Definitions}

(A) "Governmental Agency" refers to any county government or municipality.

(B) "Acceptable Piping Material" refers to piping material that meets current and recognized standards as issued by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) and the American Water Works Association (AWWA).

Section 2. {Procurement Procedures for Water and Wastewater Piping}

(A) Government agencies shall engage in open competitive bidding to study, plan, design, construct, develop, finance, maintain, rebuild, improve, repair, or operate water and wastewater utilities; and

(B) All procurement transactions for piping material shall be conducted in a manner that provides for open and free competition. All acceptable piping materials shall be

considered in the procurement process. Procurement procedures shall not restrict or eliminate competition.

(C) Unlawful restrictions on competition include, but are not limited to specifying only a brand name product or particular type of material instead of either allowing an equal product to be offered, or describing the performance of the relevant requirements of the procurement.

(D) The specifications for a public works project must provide that all acceptable piping materials may be acquired for and used in the project.

(E) Municipal design engineers shall have the autonomy to set technical material performance criteria based on specific project conditions.

(F) The use of any particular pipe material shall not be mandated, nor shall the ability of project engineers to use any piping material that meets specifications be restricted.

(G) In addition, the design engineer shall consider acceptable piping material to be suitable for the project only if the use of that material is commensurate with sound engineering practices and project requirements.

Section 3. {Severability clause}

Section 4. {Repealer clause}

Section 5. {Effective date}

**A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A LOCAL TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE RESIDENTS OF
(INSERT JURISDICTION)**

WHEREAS, this great nation is built on the solid foundation of government being of the people, by the people and for the people, and

WHEREAS, it has become too commonplace for governments at all levels, to solve financial problems by creating new taxes and/or increasing existing taxes with little or no regard for the abilities of people to pay those taxes, and

WHEREAS, the responsibility of government is also extended to the provision of needed services to the people and to ensure that those services meet the test of what a needed governmental service is; and

WHEREAS, the authority granted to a government to levy taxes carries with it the responsibility to operate that government in an efficient, cost effective manner, devoid of pork barrel projects and political favoritisms; and

NOW, BE IT RESOLVED, by the (Insert Elected Body) of the (Insert Jurisdiction), that there is hereby established a Local Taxpayer Bill of Rights defined as follows;

1. Any proposed tax rate increases will be discussed in an open and transparent manner
2. Any proposed tax rate increases will include extended public comment periods beyond what is required by state law
3. Any tax rate increase should be passed with a supermajority vote of (Insert Elected Body)
4. Any budget surpluses created by excess revenues in the general fund will be returned to the taxpayers by tax rate reductions

Passed and adopted by the (Insert Elected Body) of the (Jurisdiction), on the (Insert date)

Regulating Containers to Protect Business and Consumer Choice

Summary

The municipal level of government often is the best place to address matters of importance to local residents. In order to protect economic choices for consumers and merchants; local budgets being strained already, the cost of regulation, inspection, and enforcement should not be borne by local families, merchants, and taxpayers.

Model Resolution

Section 1. {Title}

This resolution may be cited as the Regulating Containers to Protect Businesses and Consumer's Choice Resolution.

Section 2.

{Definitions}

(A) Defines "containers" as: reusable bags, disposable bags, boxes, cups, and bottles that are made of cloth, paper, plastic, extruded polystyrene, or similar materials, which are designed for one-time use or for transporting merchandise or food from food and retail facilities.

Section 3. {Regulating Containers to Protect Businesses and Consumers}

- [Insert Jurisdiction] finds that:
- Prudent regulation of containers is crucial to the welfare of [insert state's] economy;
- Retail and food establishments are sensitive to the costs and regulation of containers;
- If the individual political subdivisions of the state regulate such containers, there exists the potential for confusing and varying regulations that could lead to unnecessary increased costs for retail and food establishments to comply with such regulations; and,
- Consumers are adversely affected by varying regulations on containers through inconsistent availability and cost of said containers from locality to locality.
- The free market is the best arbiter of the container.

Section 3. {Severability clause}

Section 4. {Repealer clause}

Section 5. {Effective date}

Approved by American City County Exchange at the ALEC Annual Meeting on Thursday July 23, 2015 and Friday, July 24, 2015. Approved by ALEC Board of Directors on September 4, 2015.

Parliamentary Motions Guide

Based on *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (10th Edition)*

The motions below are listed in order of precedence. Any motion can be introduced if it is higher on the chart than the pending motion.

YOU WANT TO:	YOU SAY:	INTERRUPT?	2ND?	DEBATE?	AMEND?	VOTE?
§21 Close meeting	I move to adjourn	No	Yes	No	No	Majority
§20 Take break	I move to recess for	No	Yes	No	Yes	Majority
§19 Register complaint	I rise to a question of privilege	Yes	No	No	No	None
§18 Make follow agenda	I call for the orders of the day	Yes	No	No	No	None
§17 Lay aside temporarily	I move to lay the question on the table	No	Yes	No	No	Majority
§16 Close debate	I move the previous question	No	Yes	No	No	2/3
§15 Limit or extend debate	I move that debate be limited to ...	No	Yes	No	Yes	2/3
§14 Postpone to a certain time	I move to postpone the motion to ...	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
§13 Refer to committee	I move to refer the motion to ...	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
§12 Modify wording of motion	I move to amend the motion by ...	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
§11 Kill main motion	I move that the motion be postponed indefinitely	No	Yes	Yes	No	Majority
§10 Bring business before assembly (a main motion)	I move that [or "to"] ...	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority

Parliamentary Motions Guide

Based on *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (10th Edition)*

Incidental Motions - no order of precedence. Arise incidentally and decided immediately.

YOU WANT TO:	YOU SAY:	INTERRUPT	2 ND ?	DEBATE?	AMEND?	VOTE?
§23 Enforce rules	Point of order	Yes	No	No	No	None
§24 Submit matter to assembly	I appeal from the decision of the chair	Yes	Yes	Varies	No	Majority
§25 Suspend rules	I move to suspend the rules which ...	No	Yes	No	No	2/3
§26 Avoid main motion altogether	I object to the consideration of the question	Yes	No	No	No	2/3
§27 Divide motion	I move to divide the question	No	Yes	No	Yes	Majority
§29 Demand rising vote	I call for a division	Yes	No	No	No	None
§33 Parliamentary law question	Parliamentary inquiry	Yes	No	No	No	None
§33 Request for information	Point of information	Yes	No	No	No	None

Motions That Bring a Question Again Before the Assembly - no order of precedence. Introduce only when nothing else pending.

§34 Take matter from table	I move to take from the table ...	No	Yes	No	No	Majority
§35 Cancel previous action	I move to rescind ...	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	2/3 maj. w/ notice
§37 Reconsider motion	I move to reconsider the vote ...	No	Yes	Varies	No	Majority

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Reforming subsidized housing policy in the City of Phoenix and the State of Arizona

LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROGRAM OVERVIEW

- ▶ The federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credit ("LIHTC" or "Tax Credit") program was established by the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to encourage construction and rehabilitation of low-income rental housing.
- ▶ The Arizona Department of Housing ("ADOH") is the housing credit agency responsible for allocating Tax Credits to Owners of qualifying residential rental Projects through a competitive application process.
- ▶ ADOH allocates Low-Income Housing Tax Credits pursuant to a Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) that uses selection criteria amended annually by the state with input from municipalities and the developer community.
- ▶ The first goal of the program is to maximize the number of affordable rental housing units added to the existing housing stock.

Catalyst for Change

- ▶ 2014 – Phoenix saw the most expensive private sector apartment complex ever sold in the city of Phoenix at \$277,000 per door Broadstone Camelback in the Biltmore.
- ▶ 2014 – Phoenix approved spending \$281,000 per door to build the Frank Luke affordable housing apartment complex at 16th and Van Buren St near St Luke Hospital. City of Phoenix already owned the land. Units of this type could have been built for \$150,000 a door. Phoenix insisted on being the developer.
- ▶ The non-profit and private developers produce housing at a far lower cost per unit and could build at least 50% more affordable housing units than the city. Also, for the same dollars, helping that many more low income families.
- ▶ Lets take a look at the two projects...

Broadstone vs Frank Luke Apartments



Broadstone vs Frank Luke Apartments



Broadstone vs Frank Luke Apartments



Broadstone vs Frank Luke Apartments



The City as the Developer

Phoenix insisted on being the developer of the Frank Luke project... why?

- ▶ By acting as the developer of the project Phoenix gets a "Developer Fee" of up to a 14% from the federal government.
- ▶ City took in \$4,772,297 in combined fees and taxes from Frank Luke II & III as the sole developer. Frank Luke II was \$41,535.50 per unit.
- ▶ The City's large and growing bureaucracy lives off of these federal dollars.
- ▶ This means that funding is diverted from private and nonprofit organizations to a city bureaucracy that has an average cost of over \$109,000 per employee

Why Reform is Needed

- ▶ High Cost: Our study reflects that government development projects have a much higher cost per unit (reaching \$283,000 for Frank Luke III not including the land, as compared to private and non-profit per unit cost of \$166,000)
- ▶ Unfair Competition:
 - ▶ The City of Phoenix and Maricopa County were awarded 50% of the Funding in 2014.
 - ▶ Municipalities / Counties have selection point categories that they control therefore giving them undue competitive advantage in the project selection process.
 - ▶ The city also has tremendous negotiating leverage in and co-developer selection / negotiation processes.
- ▶ More Affordable Housing: Private and nonprofit developers will produce more units benefiting more low income residents.
- ▶ Better Support Services: Non-profits can provide better support services and have a stronger social services capability than the government can provide.
- ▶ Bottom line is that Municipalities should not be able to dominate project selection.

Reform Strategic Objective

The objective is to increase affordable housing units developed and improve supportive services provided to low-income residents by driving more funding to private and nonprofit organizations.

Reform - Selection Criteria Changes

- ▶ **Co-Developer Structure**: Government Applicants are required to act as a Co-Developer, rather than sole Developer. Public and private partnership required.
- ▶ **City Council Approval Required**: The uses of their developer fee must be approved by the applicable city council, board of Supervisor or Governing Board. Invest in support services vs paying for large government.
- ▶ **Supportive Services**: Must be provided by private non-profit companies rather than government entities. A waiver is required for government entities to provide supportive services.
- ▶ **Municipality / County Cap**: Municipalities / Counties collectively combined into one developer. They compete against each other for a maximum two projects per year 1.5MM per project / \$3MM total. Must score competitively against all other projects to be awarded.

Long Term Benefits to Arizona

- ▶ Arizona will build a larger affordable housing base serving more low income families.
- ▶ Awarding funding to private and non-profit developers will create more economic benefits, including jobs; than growing government bureaucracy.
- ▶ Nonprofits will provide better support service to low income renters improving retention and lives.
- ▶ Driving funding to non-profit service organizations will build a stronger social services capability than relying on government.

alec.org

ALEC American
Legislative
Exchange
Council
LIMITED GOVERNMENT • FREE MARKETS • FEDERALISM

CITY HALL

The American City County Exchange (ACCE)

The American City County Exchange works with local elected officials to promote efficiency and minimize waste by implementing limited government, free market solutions. The American City County Exchange is an affiliate of the American Legislative Exchange Council.

The American City County Exchange (ACCE)

is America's only free market forum for village, town, city and county policymakers. ACCE brings together local elected officials, leading industry experts and policy analysts to share ideas and experiences with their counterparts from around the country.

In municipalities across America, people debate to find the best policy solutions, but the free market perspective is often left by the wayside. Working together, ACCE members learn from others' challenges and evaluate how free market policies work when applied to local governments.

ACCE members receive academic research and analysis from policy experts who work with issues, processes and problem-solving strategies upon which municipal officials vote. Provided with important policy education, lawmakers become more informed and better equipped to serve the needs of their communities.

"Membership in the American City County Exchange gives local councilmembers and commissioners an opportunity to collaborate with other municipal leaders and develop policies that will change the course of local governance and create opportunities for individual success."

—Jon Russell, National Director

"ACCE helps connect me with other municipal officials who desire more efficiency and economic freedom in their communities."

—Levi Tappan, City Councilman
Page, Arizona

Learn More

To learn more about the American City County Exchange or to become a member, please visit www.alec.org/ACCE

American City County Exchange
2900 Crystal Drive, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Tel: 703.373.0933
Fax: 703.373.0927



MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

To Join the American City County Exchange, please fill out and return the below form

Title _____
Last Name _____
First _____
District Number _____
Leadership Positions _____
Committee Assignments _____
Mailing Address 1: Municipal Office
Street Address _____
P.O. Box _____
City _____ State _____ ZIP _____
Mailing Address 2: ☐ Home ☐ Business
Street Address _____
P.O. Box _____
City _____ State _____ ZIP _____
Phone _____
Cell Phone _____
Email _____
Card: ☐ Visa ☐ MC ☐ AMEX ☐ Disc.
Card Number _____ Exp. _____
Security Code: _____
☐ Check Included (\$100.00 for a two-year membership)

American Legislative Exchange Council is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization.
All contributions and membership fees are tax deductible
IRS Tax Code #52-0140979